DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 866 IR 006 984

AUTHOR Johnson, Catherine J.
TITLE Classification Systems Used in Illinois Public Community College Learning Resource Centers.
PUB DATE Dec 74
NOTE 41p.: Master's Thesis, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cataloging: *Classification: *Instructional Materials Centers: *Junior College Libraries; Library Collections: Library Surveys: Questionnaires; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *Illinois

ABSTRACT

Using a survey to identify the classification systems employed in Illinois public community college instructional materials centers, this study considered three questions: Was there a trend developing in the use of the Library of Congress (LC) system? What factors influenced this trend? Was this trend more evident in large centers than in small centers? An analysis of the data gathered from 40 of the 47 questionnaires sent to resource center directors revealed the following: (1) 70 percent of the centers used the LC system and 30 percent used the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) system; (2) economy, up-to-dateness, and greater flexibility influenced the selection of LC over DDC: (3) browsing capabilities, students' knowledge of the system, inheritance of the system, and the expense of reclassification influenced the selection of DDC over LC: (4) librarians' training in the use of the systems did not influence system selection; and (5) LC was the most prevalent system adopted in all sizes of centers surveyed. This study includes a bibliography and appendices which contain a list of colleges polled, a sample cover letter, and a sample questionnaire. (FM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED181866

CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS USED IN ILLINOIS PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEARNING RESOURCE CENTERS

by

Catherine Johnson

B.S. in Elementary Education, LeMoyne Owen College, 1971

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Catherine J. Johnson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR006984

A Research Paper Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements of the
Master of Science Degree

Department of Instructional Materials in the Graduate School
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
December, 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the problem	2
Hypotheses	2
Significance of the Problem	3
Definition of Terms	3
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	5
III. RESEARCH DESIGN	10
Introduction	10
Design	11
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	14
Introduction	14
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	24
Summary	24
Conclusions	25
Recommendations	26
BIBLIOGRAPHY	28
APPENDICES	30
A. Illinois Public Community Colleges and Their Classification Systems	30
B. Cover Letter	33
C. Questionnaire	34

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Utilization of Classification Systems.....	15
II.	Change In Classification Systems.....	16
III.	Factors in the Selection of the (L.C.) Classification System.....	17
IV.	Factors in the Selection of the (Dewey Decimal) Classification System.....	19
V.	Prior Training as a Selcetion Factor.....	21
VI.	Number of Volumes In Collection.....	22

CHAPTER I

Introduction

History has reflected that a common element within libraries has been a system of classification. A system of library classification has existed since the ancient Egyptians of 260 B.C. but the modern revised system of today was not developed until the latter half of the nineteenth century. American librarians were crucial designers of these modern library classification systems.[1] Librarians throughout this country adopted many of these systems but the system created by Melvil Dewey in 1873 and known as the Dewey Decimal Classification System was prevalent in this country and abroad.

Although the Dewey Decimal Classification System was common at the beginning of the twentieth century, a few large university libraries adopted the Library of Congress (LC) classification system. This system was devised by Charles Martel, the chief classifier for the Library of Congress.[2]

---

[1]W.C. Berwich Sayers, A Manual of Classification for Librarians, (London: Andre Deutsche, 1967), 11.

[2]Edward G. Halley, The Trend to L.C., Louisiana State University Series in Library Lectures, no. 1 (Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University, 1967), p. 34.

In recent years, several pertinent studies have revealed that numerous university and college libraries previously utilizing the Dewey Decimal Classification System have now adopted the Library of Congress Classification System for their collections. This study was to survey the Illinois Public Community College Learning Resource Centers for confirmation of this trend.

Statement of the Problem

The basic purpose of this study was to identify the classification systems employed in Illinois Public Community College Learning Resource Centers. In addition to this purpose, the following questions were formulated for study in this survey:

1. Was there a trend developing in the use of the Library of Congress Classification System in Illinois Public Community College Learning Resource Centers?
2. What factors influenced this trend?
3. Was this trend more evident in large learning resource centers as opposed to small learning resource centers?

These questions suggest the following hypotheses:

1. The Library of Congress Classification System will be more prevalent in the learning resource centers as opposed to the Dewey Decimal Classification System.
2. Economy, up-to-dateness and flexibility will be more influential in the selection of the Library of Congress Classification System as opposed to the Dewey Decimal Classification System.
3. Browsing capabilities, and student's knowledge of the system will be more influential in the selection of the Dewey Decimal Classification System as opposed to the Library of Congress Classification System.

4. The librarian's prior training in the use of the system will be more influential in the selection of the Dewey Decimal Classification System as opposed to the Library of Congress Classification.

5. The Library of Congress Classification System will be more frequently used in large learning resource centers as opposed to small learning resource centers.

Significance of the Problem

The particular research problem was significant for the following reasons:

1. The utilization of one classification system in Illinois Public Community Colleges could assist in the development of a standard classification system in all learning resource centers.

2. This data will be a subsidy for present and future use in community college learning resource centers.

Definition of Terms

The following terms require definition:

1. Community College. A two-year institution of higher education which offers less than a baccalaureate degree and which requires its students to be high school graduates or to be beyond high school age. The terms junior and technical denote the same thing.

2. Classification of Library Materials. The assignment of books and other materials to their proper places in a system of classification.

3. Classification System. A scheme for the arrangement ofbooks and other materials according to subject or form. It also serves as a device to group and maintain materials in a logical order on the shelves.

4. Dewey Decimal. A numerical notation classification system assigning a minimum of three numeric digits. It divides all knowledge into ten main subject groups. These main classes can be further divided until the proper "depth" of classification is reached. The Dewey Decimal Classification was formed in 1873 by Melvil Dewey.

5. Library of Congress. An enumerative scheme with mixed notation of letters and numbers. The whole field of knowledge is divided into 21 groups using all the letters of the alphabet except the letters I, O, W, X, and Y to represent these groups.

6. Learning Resource Center. The department housing print and non-print forms of communication resources and the necessary equipment and service to permit their utilization.

7. Factor. An element contributing to a result.

8. Director of Learning Resource Center. A professional staff member with a graduate degree who has administrative duties governing a learning resource center.

9. Influential Factors. Those elements that exert power to produce results by unnoticeable means.

CHAPTER II

Review of Related Literature

This review consists of literature concerning the classification systems in community college libraries and other academic libraries as provided by professionals in this educational field. The literature concerning classification in community college libraries was scant, especially that concerning learning resource centers. However, there was a substantial amount found on classification trends in university and college libraries. Dale M. Bentz and Thera P. Cavender concluded that knowledge of recent trends leading toward reclassification projects was essential because of the growing interest in these projects.[1]

There have been two comprehensive surveys made on classification systems in junior college libraries. These are helpful in examining influential factors in the selection of a system. Arthur Ray Rowland (1960) discovered that 96.5 percent of the junior colleges listed in the 1961 Junior Directory employed the Dewey Decimal Classification System and 3.5 percent utilized the Library of Congress Classification System (L.C.) Two other conclusions drawn from this

---

[1]Dale M. Bentz and Thera P. Cavender, "Reclassification Recataloging," Library Trends 2 (October 1953): 253.

study were that librarian's had become displeased with the Dewey Decimal Classification System, and that the Library of Congress Classification System was the most beneficial system to adopt for a new library.[1]

In his analysis, Desmond Taylor (1968) revealed that the Library of Congress Classification System was the most prevailing in use in junior college libraries. Of the 690 junior colleges responding, 38.2 percent adopted the Library of Congress classification and 48 percent reported having changed classification to the Library of Congress system. Twenty-one new colleges built after the 1960 survey were in the process of reclassifying to (L.C.). Taylor noted that economy was the most influential factor in the selection of the Library of Congress Classification System.[2]

Three relevant articles were located on classification systems employed in junior college libraries. James Pirie, in his article "Junior College Library Processing" mentioned that Dewey was consistently adopted in junior college libraries. He pointed out that a dissatisfaction in the use of this system was noticeable since six libraries were considering a switch to the Library of Congress system.[3]

---

[1]Arthur Ray Rowland, "Cataloging and Classification in Junior College Libraries," Library Resources and Technical Services 7 (Summer 1963): 254-8.

[2]Desmond Taylor, "Classification Trends in Junior College Libraries," College and Research Libraries 29 (September 1968): 351-5.

[3]James W. Pirie, "Junior College Library Processing," Library Trends 14 (October 1965): 170.

56.4% LC 42.9% Dewey

In her doctoral dissertation, Elizabeth Matthews studied directors of learning resource centers. She observed that more than half of the institutions utilized the Library of Congress Classification System. Several expressed dissatisfaction with Dewey and were reclassifying to (L.C.)[1]

At the Louisiana State University Library Lectures, Maurice Tauber (1967) discussed the use of classification systems in academic libraries. He reported that most of those academic libraries established after 1957 had employed the Library of Congress Classification System. In concluding, Tauber pointed out that the Library of Congress Classification System was not without problems, but that its advantages outweighed the disadvantages.[2]

Concerning influential factors in the selection of a classification system, several articles were located. Lewis College (1969) reclassified from the Dewey Decimal System to the Library of Congress Classification System for economy, the smallness of their collection, and the librarian's knowledge of the system.[3]

---

[1]Elizabeth Woodfin Matthews, "Characteristics and Academic Preparation of Directors of Library Learning Resource Centers in Selected Community Colleges." (Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1972), p. 130.

[2]Maurice Tauber, Some Experience in Library Surveys and Classification, Louisiana State University Series in Library Lectures, no. 2 (Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University, 1968), p. 5.

[3]Albert V. Rybiansky, "Lewis College Switches to Library of Congress Classification," Illinois Libraries 52 (November 1970): 910-11.

Louis Shores thought that the Library of Congress Classification System should be adopted in junior colleges because of the trend toward independent study in education. He felt that (L.C.) was the most suitable system for achieving centralized cataloging.[1]

At a conference on Reclassification - Rationale and Problems, Elton S. Shell mentioned reclassification projects at the San Bernadino Valley College. He indicated that San Bernadino Valley switched to the Library of Congress system because of it's flexibility, many enumerated classes, structure, currency and availability of schedules and call numbers.[2]

An analysis of literature provided by Edward G. Halley indicated that the Library of Congress system was more economical to utilize than the Dewey Decimal Classification System. Halley advocated the use of the Library of Congress Classification System because of the cost figures disclosed by the University of Oregon which showed the Library of Congress prices to be .20 per title and the Dewey Decimal System to be $1.26 per title.[3]

---

[1]Louis Shores, "The Junior College Impact on Academic Librarianship," College and Research Libraries 30 (May 1969): 214-21.

[2]Elton S. Shell, "A Rationale For Using the Library of Congress System in Reclassification," Reclassification - Rationale and Problems Vol. I ed. Jean M. Perrault (Maryland: University of Maryland, 1968), p. 30.

[3]Edward G. Halley, The Trend to L.C., Louisiana State University Series in Library Lectures, no. 1 (Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University, 1967), p. 33.

In most instances the literature advocated the adoption of the Library of Congress Classification System. However, Benjamin A. Cluster declared that Dewey was repeatedly adopted for its stability, hierarchical characteristics, mnemonic values and centralized application.[1]

Jean M. Perreault in Rationale and Problems reports that the pressure of growth, cost of personnel, economics of planning together with a very natural and proper desire for useful change and innovation, have encouraged an increasing number of American libraries to consider reclassification in the hope of improving service while reducing cost.[2]

---

[1]Benjamin A. Cluster, "Problems in Editing the Seventeenth Edition of the Dewey Decimal Classification System," Paper presented at a two-phase conference held at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, November 1966 and May 1967.

[2]Jean M. Perreault, ed., Reclassification - Rationale and Problems (Maryland: University of Maryland, 1968), p. 7.

CHAPTER III

Research Design

The basic purpose of the study was to identify the classification systems employed in Illinois Public Community Colleges. In addition, the following questions were formulated for study:

1. Was there a trend developing in the use of the Library of Congress Classification System in the community college learning resource centers?
2. What factors influenced this trend?
3. Was this trend more evident in large learning resource centers as opposed to small learning resource centers?

The forty-seven Illinois Public Community Colleges recognized by the Illinois Community Board were investigated. The 1974 Community and Junior College Directory provided pertinent information on the subjects. The large number of Illinois Public Community Colleges was a decisive factor in the selection of this sample population.

A questionnaire served as the data gathering instrument. Forty-seven questionnaires with a cover letter and stamped, self-addressed envelopes were sent to the directors of the learning resource centers. The total response received was 40 (85.1 percent) of the 47 questionnaires sent out in the survey.

The questionnaire was constructed in such a manner that would best provide answers for the study. (Appendix C) When formed, it was composed of five questions on one page.

The questions required a check for the appropriate answers. Although the questionnaire was brief, these questions were aimed at finding information.

Question one identified the responding institution. It was hypothesized that the Library of Congress Classification System would be more prevalent in the learning resource centers as opposed to the Dewey Decimal System. Question two was designed to measure this hypothesis. It identified the classification systems employed in the responding institution.

The "American Library Associatian standards" recommended 20,000 volumes as the basic number of volumes meeting curriculum needs in community colleges.[1] As a result, question three was designed to test whether or not the Library of Congress Classification System was more frequently used in large learning resource centers. In conjunction with this question, the following scale was devised to provide criterion for differentiating between the size of individual collections for each learning resource center.

Number of Volumes	Size of Institution
50,001 and more volumes	Large
20,001 to 50,000 volumes	Medium
20,000 and less volumes	Small

---

[1] "AAJC-ACRL Guidelines for Two-Year College Library Learning Resource Centers," College and Research Libraries, No. 9 (October, 1971), 266-78.

The researcher designated those learning resource centers with 20,001 to 50,000 volumes as medium size institutions because of the "American Library Association standards" that recommended 20,000 volumes as a basic number of volumes in community colleges. Therefore, those with larger collections were designated as large institutions and the same categorization was used for centers with small collections.

Question four was designed to analyze those hypotheses that dealt with influential factors in the selection of classification systems. To determine whether factors were influential in the selection of a classification system a scale was devised by the investigator. The factors were ranked as follows:

1. Those factors having the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 recorded most frequently were termed influential factors. (Appendix C)
2. Those factors having the numbers 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 recorded most frequently were termed less influential factors. (Appendix C)

For factors to be considered influential, percentages had to be 60 percent or higher.

The increased interest in reclassification has become especially apparent in colleges and university libraries. Therefore, question five was directed at finding the percentage of Illinois Public Community College learning resource centers planning to reclassify in the impending future.

Percentages of 60 percent or higher were considered statistically significant in this study. Analysis of the data in this study was made by means of frequency distributions and percentages for comparison between items.

CHAPTER IV

Analysis of Data

The subjects were the forty-seven public community colleges in Illinois recognized by the Illinois Community Board. The basic purpose of the study was to identify the classification systems employed in the community college learning resource centers. In addition to this purpose, these questions were formulated for study in the survey:

1. Was there a trend developing in the use of the Library of Congress Classification System in Illinois Public Community Colleges?
2. What factors influenced this trend?
3. Was this trend more evident in large learning resource centers as opposed to small learning resource centers?

It was assumed by the researcher that the sample population was interested in the study because of the high percentage of questionnaires returned. The total response received was forty (85.10%) of the forty-seven questionnaires sent out in the survey. Of those replying, twenty-eight (70.00%) employed the Library of Congress Classification System and twelve (30.00%) utilized the Dewey Decimal Classification System. For statistical reasoning, the 85.10% was equated to 100% in the analysis.

The percentages of respondents that employed the Library of Congress and the Dewey Decimal Classification Systems were tabulated in Table I. (For a complete list of the responding institutions and their classification systems, see Appendix A)

TABLE I

UTILIZATION OF CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS

Classification System	Number Responding	Percent
Library of Congress	28	70.00%
Dewey Decimal	12	30.00%

The Library of Congress Classification System was employed by 70 percent and the Dewey Decimal Classification was utilized by 30 percent of the respondents. Hypothesis number one, that the Library of Congress Classification system will be more prevalent in the learning resource centers as opposed to the Dewey Decimal Classification System, was accepted by the researcher. The 70 percent response revealed that there was a trend developing in the use of the Library of Congress system in the learning resource centers.

Of those respondents employing the Dewey Decimal Classification System, only two (16.67%) were anticipating a change in classification systems. (Table II) There were no respondents indicating a shift from the Library of Congress system.

TABLE II

CHANGE IN CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS

System	Number	Percent
L.C. to Dewey	0	0.00%
Dewey to L.C.	2	16.67%

Three directors utilizing the Library of Congress Classification Sytem reported that they had reclassified from the Dewey Decimal system. A large percentage (75%) of the respondents using Dewey indicated the factor (too expensive to reclassify) influential in their selection of the system. This suggested that those directors were concerned about changing to another system.

To test hypothesis two, that economy, up-to-dateness and flexibility will be more influential in the selection of the Library of Congress Classification System as opposed to the Dewey Decimal Classification System, the researcher

accepted the factors as being influential if they were more frequently assigned the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 on the ranking scale in the selection of the Library of Congress Classification system as opposed to the Dewey system. (Table III)

TABLE III

FACTORS IN THE SELECTION

OF THE (L.C.) CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

Factors	Influential		Less Influential	
	No.	%	No.	%
Less expensive	17	60.71	9	32.14
Too expensive to reclassify	1	3.57	11	39.29
Size of the collection	14	50.00	8	28.57
Prior training	6	21.32	11	39.29
System already in use	11	39.29	5	17.86
Up-to-dateness	19	67.86	0	0.00
Greater flexibility	24	85.71	0	0.00
Browsing capabilities	11	39.29	7	25.00
Student's knowledge of the system	3	10.71	12	42.86

Concerning influential factors in the selection of the Library of Congress system, the respondents reported that economy (designated as less expensive) 60.71%; up-to-dateness (67.86%), and greater flexibility (85.71%) were influential factors in their selection of the Library of Congress Classification System. Contary to this, the same factors were indicated as being less influential in the selection of the Dewey Decimal Classification System. (see Table IV) Those directors utilizing Dewey reported that economy(66.67%), up-to-dateness (75.00%), and greater flexibility were less influential factors in their selection. Hypothesis number two was accepted by the researcher. Other respondents employing (L.C.) indicated factors not listed as influential in their situations:

> L.C. used from the beginning to tie into the Northern Illinois University Library.
>
> Major colleges and universities use it.
>
> We would better serve our transfer students by acquainting them to L.C.
>
> Edition changes and relocations in Dewey.
>
> Ease of access to cataloging information by way of MARC tape information, commercially produced cards.

Browsing capabilities, and student's knowledge of the system when analyzed by the researcher were found to be more influential in the selection of the Dewey system as opposed to the Library of Congress system. (see Table IV)

TABLE IV

FACTORS IN THE SELECTION

OF THE DEWEY DECIMAL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

Factors	Influential		Less Influential	
	No.	%	No.	%
Less expensive	3	25.00	8	66.67
Too expensive to reclassify	9	75.00	3	25.00
Size of the collection	6	50.00	6	50.00
Prior training	7	58.33	4	33.33
System already in use	12	100.00	0	0.00
Up-to-dateness	2	16.67	9	75.00
Greater flexibility	2	16.67	8	66.67
Browsing capabilities	9	75.00	2	16.67
Student's knowledge of the system	10	83.33	1	8.33

The total (12) respondents utilizing the Dewey Decimal system reported that browsing capabilities (75.00%), and student's knowledge of the system (83.33%) were influential factors in their selection of the system. In contrast to

the above, those directors employing (L.C.) (See Table III) indicated that browsing capabilities (25.00%), and student's knowledge of the system (42.86%) were less influential factors in their selection. With this evidence, hypothesis number three was accepted by the researcher. Other factors that were indicated as being influential in the selection of the Dewey system were: too expensive to reclassify (75.00%), and system already in use when employed (100%). Contrary to the above, these factors were designated as less influential in the selection of the (L.C.) system. One respondent reported that consideration had been given to changing from Dewey to the (L.C.) system, but that it was vetoed for two principal reasons:

1. Dewey was quite adequate for a collection of 100,000 volumes.
2. The students would suffer from the confusion of a dual system during the transition period.

Responses concerning prior training in the use of the classification systems provided these results. Directors using Dewey (58.33%) and directors using (L.C.) (21.43%) reported it as an influential factor in their selection of the system. (See Table V)

TABLE V

TYPE OF PRIOR CLASSIFICATION TRAINING

AS A SELECTION FACTOR

System	Influential		Less Influential	
	No.	%	No.	%
Library of Congress	6	21.32	11	39.29
Dewey Decimal	7	58.33	4	33.33

When the data were analyzed, the results were of no great significance to the study because of the slight difference found between the comparison of prior training as an influential or as a less influential factor in the selection of both systems. Less than half of the directors (39.29%) utilizing (L.C.) reported it as a less influential factor in their selection. As a result, hypothesis number four was accepted with reservation by the researcher. By this it is meant that there was not a considerable enough difference found in the survey to indicate it as influential in the selection of a system of classification to be fully accepted by the researcher.

Hypothesis number five was formulated to provide an answer to question number three which was as follows: Was this trend more evident in large learning resource centers as opposed to small learning resource centers? (See Table VI)

TABLE VI

NUMBER OF VOLUMES IN COLLECTION

Volumes	L.C.		Dewey	
	No.	%	No.	%
75,001 or more	2	5.00	0	0.00
50,001 - 75,000	7	17.50	0	0.00
20,001 - 50,000	14	35.00	10	25.00
10,001 - 20,000	4	10.00	2	5.00
10,000 or less	1	2.50	0	0.00
Total	28	70.00	12	30.00

Of the forty community colleges responding, nine (22.50%) had large collections, twenty-four (60.00%) had medium sized collections, and seven (17.50%) had small collections in their learning resource centers. The Library of Congress system was utilized by nine (100%) of the directors in large learning resource centers, fourteen (58.33%) of those in medium size learning resource centers, and five (71.43%) of the seven directors of small learning resource centers.

The data revealed that the Library of Congress system was the most prevalent system utilized in all sizes of learning resource centers. Hypothesis number five, therefore, was

Hypothesis number five was formulated to provide an answer to question number three: Was this trend more evident in large learning resource centers as opposed to small learning resource centers? (see Table VI)

TABLE VI

USE OF CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM BY NUMBER OF VOLUMES IN COLLECTION

Volumes	LC System		DDC System	
	No.	%	No.	%
50,001 or more	9	22.50	0	0.00
20,001 to 50,000	14	35.00	10	25.00
20,000 or less	5	12.50	2	5.00
Total	28	70.00	12	30.00

Of the forty community colleges responding, nine (22.50%) had large collections, twenty-four (60.00%) had medium sized collections, and seven (17.50%) had small collections in their learning resource centers. The LC System was utilized by nine (100%) large learning resource centers, fourteen (58.33%) medium size learning resource centers, and five (71.43%) small learning resource centers.

The data revealed that the LC System was the most prevalent system utilized in all learning resource centers:

large, medium, and small. It was used in all of the learning resource centers classified by the researcher as large. Hypothesis number five, therefore, was accepted. Only in learning resource centers with collections of medium size (20,001-50,00) was the DDC System used to any extent.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was a descriptive survey to identify the classification systems employed in Illinois public community college learning resource centers recognized by the Illinois Community College Board. In addition to this purpose, the following questions were formulated for study in this survey:

1. Was there a trend developing in the use of the LC System in Illinois public community college learning resource centers?
2. What factors influenced this trend?
3. Was this trend more evident in large learning resource centers as opposed to small learning resource centers?

In conjunction with the preceding questions, the following hypotheses were composed by the researcher:

1. The LC System is used in more learning resource resource centers than the DDC System.
2. Economy, up-to-dateness and flexibility are the most influential factors in the selection of the LC System as opposed to the DDC System.
3. Browsing capabilities and students' knowledge of the system are the most influential factors in the selection of the DDC System as opposed to the LC System.

4. The librarian's prior training in the use of the LC System or the DDC System is an influential factor in the selection of the LC System or the DDC System for the learning resource center.

5. The LC System is used more frequently in large learning resource centers than in small learning resource centers.

Forty-seven questionnaires were sent to the directors of the learning resource centers; of those, responses were received from forty or 85.1 percent. Of the total number responding, twenty-eight (70%) employed the LC System and twelve (30%) utilized the DDC System. For statistical analysis, the 85.1 percent was equated to 100 percent in the analysis.

Conclusions

The analysis revealed the following:

1. The LC System was employed by twenty-eight (70%) of the learning resource centers and the DDC System was used by twelve (30%) of the learning resource centers in Illinois Public Community Colleges. This data revealed evidence of a trend in the use of the LC System in Illinois public community college learning resource centers.
2. Those factors most influential in the selection of the LC System as opposed to the DDC System were economy, up-to-dateness, and greater flexibility. These factors were influential in the trend toward the use of the LC System in Illinois public community college learning resource centers.

3. Those factors most influential in the selection of the DDC System as opposed to the LC System were: browsing capabilities, students' knowledge of the system, system already in use when employed, and too expensive to reclassify.
4. The librarian's prior training in the use of the systems did not greatly influence the selection of either classification system.
5. The LC System was the most prevalent system adopted in all sizes of learning resource centers in Illinois public community colleges.

Recommendations

It is recommended that learning resource centers adopt the LC System as a standardized system in community colleges.

It is recommended that library schools start emphasizing the LC System as the principal classification system in use in this country rather than the DDC System.

It is recommended that high schools students be familiarized with the LC System and the DDC System before entering college.

Recommendations For Further Study

The following recommendations are made for future study and research:

1. It is recommended that a study be done on

factors that are influential in the selection of classification systems in community colleges on a national basis.

2. It is recommended that studies be made on the students' conceptions of classification systems employed in community college learning resource centers.

3. It is recommended that a "feasability study" be made on the concept of adopting the LC System as a standardized system to be utilized in all Illinois public community college learning resource centers.

4. It is recommended that studies be made concerning the classification systems taught to high school students.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Community and Junior College Directory. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974.

American Library Association and the Association of College and Research Libraries. "Standards for the Junior College Libraries." College and Research Libraries 21 (May 1960): 200-06.

Bentz, Dale M., and Cavender, Thera P. "Reclassification Recataloging." Library Trends 2 (October 1953): 249-63.

Eaton, Thelma, and Strout, Donald E., eds. The Role of Classification in the Modern American Library. Allerton Park Institute, no.6. Champaign, Illinois: The Illini Union Bookstore, 1959.

Holley, Edward G. The Trend to LC. Louisiana State University Series in Library Lectures, no. 1. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1967.

The Illinois Junior College Board. Directory of Illinois Public Junior Colleges. Springfield, Illinois: The Illinois Junior College Board, 1970.

Immroth, John Phillip. A Guide to the Library of Congress Classification. Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1971.

Maltby, Arthur., ed. Classification in the 1970's. Hamden, Connecticut: Linnet Books, 1972.

Matthews, Elizabeth Woodfin. "Characteristics and Academic Preparations of Directors of Library Learning Resource Centers in Selected Community Colleges." Ph. D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University-Carbondale, 1972.

Mathis, Raimund E., and Taylor, Desmond. Adopting the Library of Congress Classification System. New York: R.R. Bowker Company, 1971.

Neal, K.W. Technical College Libraries. England: K.W. Neal, 1965.

Perreault, Jean M., ed. Reclassification-Rationale and Problems. Maryland: University of Maryland, 1968.

Pirie, James W. "Junior College Processing." Library Trends 14 (October 1965): 166-73.

Platt, Peter. Libraries in Colleges of Education. London: The Library Association, 1972.

Richardson, Ernest Cushing. Classification: Theoretical and Practical. Hamden, Connecticut: The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1964.

Rowland, Arthur Ray. "Cataloging and Reclassification in Junior College Libraries." Library Resources and Technical Services 7 (Summer 1963): 254-58.

Rybiansky, Albert V. "Lewis College Switches to Library of Congress Classification." Illinois Libraries 52 (November 1970): 910-14.

Samore, Theodore.,ed. Problems in Library Classification Dewey 17 and Conversion. Library and Information Science Studies, no. 1. New York: R.R. Bowker Company, 1968.

Sayers, W.C. Berwick. A Manual of Classification for Libraries. London: Andre Deutsch, 1967.

Shores, Louis. "The Junior College Impact on Academic Librarianship." Library Resources and Technical Services 30 (May 1969): 214-21.

Tauber, Maurice. Some Experience in Library Surveys and Classification. Louisiana State University Series in Library Lectures, no.2. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1968.

Taylor, Desmond. "Classification Trends in Junior College Libraries." College and Research Libraries 29 (September 1968): 351-56.

Trinkner, Charles., ed. Library Services For Junior Colleges. Junior Colleges Library Series, Vol. II. Northport, Alabama: The American Southern Publishing Co., 1964.

Wasson, Martha Katherine. "Exact Record of The Process of Setting Up a Library In a Junior College and A Critical Examination of It." Master's Thesis, Southern Illinois University-Carbondale, 1964.

Wheeler, Helen Rippier. The Community College Library. Hamden, Conneticut: The Shoe String Press, Inc., 1965.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ILLINOIS PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THEIR CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS

Institution	LC	Dewey	No Response
Belleville Area College	X		
Black Hawk College	X		
Black Hawk College, East	X		
Danville Junior College		X	
Community College of Decatur			X
College of DuPage	X		
Elgin Community College		X	
William Rainey Harper College	X		
Highland Community College		X	
Illinois Central College	X		
Illinois Valley Community College			X
Joliet Junior College		X	
Kankakee Community College	X		
Kaskaskia College		X	
Kennedy-King College	X		
Kishwaukee College	X		
College of Lake County	X		
Lake Land College	X		
Lewis and Clark Community College		X	
Lincoln Land Community College	X		

APPENDIX A, cont.

Institution	LC	Dewey	No Response
Lincoln Trail College	X		
Loop College			X
John A. Logan College	X		
McHenry County College	X		
Malcolm X College	X		
Mayfair College		X	
Moraine College	X		
Morton College			X
Oakton Community College	X		
Olive-Harvey College	X		
Olney Central College		X	
Parkland College			X
Prairie State College	X		
Rend Lake College		X	
Rock Valley College	X		
Carl Sandburg College	X		
Sauk Valley College	X		
Shawnee Junior College			X
Southeastern Illinois College		X	
Southwest College	X		
Spoon River College			X
State Community College of East St. Louis	X		
Thornton Community College		X	

APPENDIX A, cont.

Institution	LC	Dewey	No Response
Triton College	X		
Wabash Valley College		X	
Waubonsee Community College	X		
Wilbur Wright College	X		

APPENDIX B

Southern Illinois
University

CARBONDALE, ILLINOIS 62901

Department of Instructional Materials

104-B Evergreen Terrace
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

September 24, 1974

Director of the Learning Resource Center

Dear Sir:

The major classification systems, Dewey and Library of Congress, are being studied in a research project, entitled Classification Systems Used In Community College Learning Resource Centers In Illinois. The purpose of this research study is to obtain information on the factors influencing the selection of a classification system, and to see if a trend is developing in the use of the Library of Congress Classification System in community college learning resource centers in Illinois.

Community Colleges in Illinois were selected for the study, because of the large number of community colleges across the state. Your response will be of educational value to the many students in community college library courses.

For your convenience in reporting, a stamped, self addressed envelope is enclosed.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Catherine Johnson

Catherine Johnson
Graduate Student
Instructional Materials
Southern Illinois University-C

APPENDIX C

Please answer the following questions:

1. Name of the Community College_____

2. Which major classification system is used by the Iearning Resource Center: Library of Congress?____ Dewey?_____ Other?____
If other is checked, please indicate which one.

3. Size of the collection by number of volumes:
_____75,001 or more _____50,001-75,000 20,001-50,000

10,001-20,000 _____10,000 or less

4. Indicate which of the following factors most influenced your selection of the classification system now in use.

Please indicate your answer by ranking each statement from 1 to 10 with 1 being the most important factor and 10 being the least important factor.

_____The system is less expensive to use.

_____It is too expensive to reclassify at the present time.

_____The size of the book collection is served best by this system.

_____I had prior training in the use of the system.

_____The system was already in use when employed.

_____The system is kept up-to-date.

_____There is greater flexibility in the system.

_____Adequate browsing is provided by the system.

_____The students know how to use the system.

_____Other (specify)

5. Are you planning to reclassify in the future? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, to which system?